

REMARKS

Claims 1-87 are pending in action, with claims 1, 8, 16, 22, 28, 33, 39, 45, 52, 60, 67, 74, and 81 being independent. Claims 1, 8, 16, 22, 28, 33, 39, 45, 52, 60, 67, 74, and 81 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 16-19, 22-25, 28-31, 33-36, 39-42, 45-58, 52-55, 60-63, 67-70, 74-77, and 81-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Wang et al. (US 2002/0003774 A1).

Claims 5-7, 13-15, 20-21, 26-27, 32, 37-38, 43-44, 49-51, 57-59, 54-66, 72-73, 78-80, and 86-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Wang in view of Shoemaker et al. (US 2003/0231715 A1). Applicants believe the Examiner's rejection of claims 54-66 is a typographical error and should read as a rejection of claims 64-66.

Claims 56, 71, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Wang in view of Kim (US 2002/0126618 A1).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 8-11, 16-19, 22-25, 28-31, 33-36, 39-42, 45-58, 52-55, 60-63, 67-70, 74-77, and 81-84 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Wang et al. (US 2002/0003774 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims

In the statement of rejection, Examiner asserts that Wang shows an OFDM system that transmits a pilot symbol structure including a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones are mirror tones of the tones in the first plurality of alternate tones. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 recites transmitting pilot information on alternate tones. Wang provides no such teaching or suggestion. As an initial matter, Wang does not teach or suggest transmitting first pilot symbols on alternate tones. Specifically, Wang shows that the first pilot symbols are always transmitted on the same tones, or the first pilot symbols are always transmitted on immediately adjacent tones. *See*, ¶ [0029] of the Wang specification (always the same frequency subcarriers are used for the transmission of the pilot symbols); ¶ [0030] of the Wang specification (succeeding pilot symbols are not transmitted in the same frequency subcarrier as the preceding pilot symbol, but in the immediately adjacent subcarrier). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Wang teaches away from the method of claim 1 and discloses always transmitting first pilot symbols on the same tones or on immediately adjacent tones.

Further, Wang's second pilot symbols are also not transmitted on alternate tones. Specifically, Wang shows that "the second pilot symbols are always transmitted in the same frequency subcarrier and at the same timepoint as the corresponding first pilot symbol." *See*, ¶ [0031] of the Wang specification. Applicants respectfully assert that Wang teaches away from the method of claim 1 and discloses always transmitting second pilot symbols on the same tones as the first pilot symbols.

In addition, contrary to Examiner's assertion, Wang does not teach or suggest that the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones are mirror tones of the tones in the first plurality of alternate tones. Rather, Wang discloses only that "every other second pilot symbol (in time and frequency dimension) is the inverse complex value of a corresponding first pilot symbol." ¶ [0031] of the Wang specification. Wang discloses transmitting at tones that are orthogonal – not reflections.

Nevertheless, in an effort to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, in part, that the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. Applicants respectfully assert that Wang does not teach or suggest alternate tones on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone.

In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) be withdrawn. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 8 and its dependent claims

Claim 8, as amended, is directed to a method comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 8 is allowable over Wang. Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8.

Claim 16 and its dependent claims

Claim 16, as amended, is directed to an apparatus comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 16 is allowable over Wang. Claim 17 depends from claim 16 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 16.

Claim 22 and its dependent claims

Claim 22, as amended, is directed to an apparatus comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides

of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 22 is allowable over Wang. Claim 23 depends from claim 22 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22.

Claim 28 and its dependent claims

Claim 28, as amended, is directed to an OFDM pilot symbol structure comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 28 is allowable over Wang. Claim 29 depends from claim 28 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 28.

Claim 33 and its dependent claims

Claim 33, as amended, is directed to an apparatus comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 33 is allowable over Wang. Claim 34 depends from claim 33 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33.

Claim 39 and its dependent claims

Claim 39, as amended, is directed to an apparatus comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol

including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 39 is allowable over Wang. Claim 40 depends from claim 39 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 39.

Claim 45 and its dependent claims

Claim 45, as amended, is directed to a computer program comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 45 is allowable over Wang. Claim 46 depends from claim 45 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 45.

Claim 52 and its dependent claims

Claim 52, as amended, is directed to an computer program comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 52 is allowable over Wang. Claim 53 depends from claim 52 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 52.

Claim 60 and its dependent claims

Claim 60, as amended, is directed to a system comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 60 is allowable over Wang. Claim 61 depends from claim 60 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 60.

Claim 67 and its dependent claims

Claim 67, as amended, is directed to a system comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 67 is allowable over Wang. Claim 68 depends from claim 67 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 67.

Claim 74 and its dependent claims

Claim 74, as amended, is directed to a system comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 74 is allowable over Wang. Claim 75 depends from claim 74 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 74.

Claim 81 and its dependent claims

Claim 81, as amended, is directed to a system comprising a first pilot symbol including pilot information on a first plurality of alternate tones, and a second pilot symbol including pilot information on a second plurality of alternate tones, wherein the tones in the second plurality of alternate tones and the first plurality of alternate tones are on opposite sides of and a same distance from a DC tone. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 81 is allowable over Wang. Claim 82 depends from claim 81 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 81.

Claims 3-4, 10-11, 18-19, 24-25, 30-31, 35-36, 41-42, 47-48, 54-55, 62-63, 69-70, 76-77, and 83-84

In the statement of rejection, Examiner asserts that Wang shows a pilot symbol structure that includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As an initial matter, claim 3 depends from claim 1 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claim 3 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 3 recites, in part, that the pilot symbol structure further includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. The Examiner asserts that pilot symbol 22 is a third pilot symbol that is the same as the first transmitted symbol 21. *See*, page 3 of Office Action. Contrary to Examiner's assertion, Wang shows that all of the pilot symbols in Figs. 3A and 3B are first pilot symbols, and all of the pilot symbols in Figs. 4A and 4B are second pilot symbols. *See*, ¶¶ [0031]-[0032] of the Wang specification. Applicants respectfully assert that Wang does not teach or suggest a third pilot symbol, that symbol being identical to the first pilot signal.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3. Claim 4 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Because Wang does not teach or suggest a third pilot symbol,

Wang also does not teach or suggest a third pilot symbol being either identical to the first pilot symbol or being between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol.

Claim 10 depends from claim 8 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8. Claim 10 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 10 is directed to a method and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 10 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 10. Claim 11 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 11 is directed to a method wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 11 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 18 depends from claim 16 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 16. Claim 18 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 18 is directed to an apparatus and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 18 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 19 depends from claim 18 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 18. Claim 19 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 19 is directed to an apparatus wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 19 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 24 depends from claim 22 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22. Claim 24 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 24 is directed to an apparatus and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 24 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 25 depends from claim 24 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 24. Claim 25 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 25 is directed to an apparatus wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 25 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 30 depends from claim 28 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 28. Claim 30 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 30 is directed to a pilot symbol structure and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 30 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30. Claim 31 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 31 is directed to a pilot symbol structure wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 31 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 35 depends from claim 33 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33. Claim 35 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 35 is directed to an apparatus and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33, claim 35 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 36 depends from claim 35 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 35. Claim 36 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 36 is directed to an apparatus wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 36 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 41 depends from claim 39 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 39. Claim 41 is separately allowable for at

least the following additional reasons. Claim 41 is directed to an apparatus and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 41 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 42 depends from claim 41 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 41. Claim 42 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 42 is directed to an apparatus wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 42 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 47 depends from claim 45 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 45. Claim 47 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 47 is directed to a computer program and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 47 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 48 depends from claim 47 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 47. Claim 48 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 48 is directed to a computer program wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 48 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 54 depends from claim 52 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 52. Claim 54 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 54 is directed to a computer program and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 54 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 55 depends from claim 54 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 54. Claim 55 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 55 is directed to a computer program wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 55 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 62 depends from claim 60 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8. Claim 62 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 62 is directed to a system and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 62 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 63 depends from claim 62 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 62. Claim 63 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 63 is directed to a system wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 63 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 69 depends from claim 67 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 67. Claim 69 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 69 is directed to a system and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 69 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 70 depends from claim 69 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 69. Claim 70 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 70 is directed to a system wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 70 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 76 depends from claim 74 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 74. Claim 76 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 76 is directed to a system and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 76 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 77 depends from claim 76 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 76. Claim 77 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 77 is directed to a system wherein the third pilot

symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 77 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 83 depends from claim 81 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 81. Claim 83 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 83 is directed to a system and includes a third pilot symbol, the third pilot symbol being identical to the first pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 3, claim 83 is allowable over Wang.

Claim 84 depends from claim 83 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 83. Claim 84 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 84 is directed to a system wherein the third pilot symbol is between the first pilot symbol and the second pilot symbol. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4, claim 84 is allowable over Wang.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 5-7, 13-15, 20-21, 26-27, 32, 37-38, 43-44, 49-51, 57-59, 54-66, 72-73, 78-80, and 86-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Wang in view of Shoemake et al. (US 2003/0231715 A1). Applicants believe Examiner's rejection of claims 54-66 is a typographical error and should read as a rejection of claims 64-66. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 5-7 depend from claim 1 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 13-15 depend from claim 8 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8.

Claims 20-21 depend from claim 16 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 16.

Claims 26-27 depend from claim 22 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 22. Claim 26 is separately allowable for at

least the following additional reasons. Claim 26 depends from claim 24 and also is allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 24.

Claim 32 depends from claim 28 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 28.

Claims 37-38 depend from claim 33 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33.

Claims 43-44 depend from claim 39 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 39. Claim 43 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 43 depends from claim 41 and also is allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 41.

Claims 49-51 depend from claim 45 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 45.

Claims 57-59 depend from claim 52 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 52.

Claims 64-66 depend from claim 60 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 60.

Claims 72-73 depend from claim 67 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 67.

Claims 78-80 depend from claim 74 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 74.

Claims 86-87 depend from claim 81 and also are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 81.

Claims 56, 71, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Wang in view of Kim (US 2002/0126618 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 56 depends from claim 54 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 54. Claim 56 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons.

Claim 56 recites, in part, performing a frequency offset estimation operation using the first and third pilot symbols. The Examiner asserts that Kim discloses frequency offset calculations for different pilot symbol intervals. *See*, page 4 of Office Action. Applicants respectfully assert that Kim does not, however, teach or suggest first and third pilot symbols. Kim discloses calculating a sliding window correlation sum in accordance with a single training symbol. *See*, e.g., ¶ [0018] of the Kim specification (a sliding window correlation summing device that receives an input in accordance with a training symbol and generates a sliding window correlation sum). Therefore, Kim does not cure the deficiencies of Wang, and Kim and Wang, alone or in combination, do not render claim 56 obvious.

Claim 71 depends from claim 69 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 69. Claim 71 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 71 is directed to a system comprising a frequency offset estimation module to perform a frequency offset estimation operation using the first and third pilot symbols. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 56, claim 71 is allowable over Kim and Wang, alone or in combination.

Claim 85 depends from claim 83 and also is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 83. Claim 85 is separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 85 is directed to a system and includes means for performing a frequency offset operation using the first and third pilot symbols. For at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 56, claim 85 is allowable over Kim and Wang, alone or in combination.

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicants' arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Applicant : Shirali et al.
Serial No. : 10/799,548
Filed : March 11, 2004
Page : 31 of 31

Attorney's Docket No.: 13361-085001 / MP0432

Applicants respectfully request that all pending claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 30, 2007

/Daniel J. Burns/

Daniel J. Burns

Reg. No. 50,222

PTO Customer No. 26200

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Facsimile: (650) 839-5071